

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 5, 7, 11, 14, 17, 19, and 20 are amended by the present amendment.

Amendments to the claims and new claims find support in the application as originally filed. Thus, no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, the specification was objected to; Claims 1, 3, 11, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent 4,491,199 to Shea et al. (herein “Shea”); Claims 2 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Shea; Claims 4, 10, 15, and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Shea in view of JP 2001-226059 to Unno; Claims 6, 8, 12, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Shea in view of U.S. Patent 5,290,975 to Mizuno et al. (herein “Mizuno”); and Claims 5, 7, 9, 14, 17, and 19 were indicated as allowable if rewritten to be in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Initially, Applicant and Applicant’s representative gratefully acknowledge the indication of allowability of Claims 5, 7, 9, 14, 17, and 19. In light of that indication, Claims 5, 7, 14, 17, and 19 are rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 5, 7, 14, 17, and 19, and any claims depending therefrom, are allowable.

In addition, regarding the objection to the specification, the specification is amended to address the minor informality identified in the Office Action. Thus, it is respectfully requested the objection to the specification be withdrawn.

Further, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of Claims 1, 3, 11, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Shea, with respect to amended independent Claims 1, 11, and 20.

Amended Claim 11 is directed to an elevator door apparatus that includes, in part, a door drive device configured to drive the elevator door, and an operation device configured to generate a door open position request provided in at least one of an inside of a car and a landing. The operation device includes a full open request button and a partial open request button. The elevator door apparatus also includes a door control device configured to select one of the partially open door position and the fully open door position based on the door open position request. Independent Claim 20 is directed to a method including related steps and having a different scope.

Applicant respectfully submits that Shea fails to disclose each of the features of Claims 11 and 20.

Shea describes an elevator system with a door operator that selectively operates the door at the end of a run from the closed to a fully open position, or from the closed to a predetermined partially open position.¹ In addition, Shea indicates that the “the detection of counter traffic flow at the target floor, such as when there are coincident car and hall calls, will allow the doors to open fully...”² In other words, Shea determines to open elevator doors fully based on a detection of counter traffic flow. However, Applicant respectfully submits that Shea is silent regarding an operation device including a full open request button and a partial open request button in an elevator car or at an elevator landing. Further, it is respectfully submitted that Shea fails to disclose or suggest selecting a door open position

¹ Shea at Abstract.

² Shea at column 1, lines 35-38.

based on a door open position request from the operation device including the full open request button and the partial open request button.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Shea fails to disclose or suggest “an operation device configured to generate a door open position request provided in at least one of an inside of a car and a landing, the operation device including a full open request button and a partial open request button; and a door control device configured to select one of the partially open door position and the fully open door position based on control information for controlling an operation of an elevator including the door open position request,” as recited in Claim 11, and as similarly recited in Claim 20.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 11 and 20 patentably define over Shea.

Applicant respectfully submits that Shea also fails to disclose or otherwise suggest each of the features of Claim 1.

Amended Claim 1 is directed to an elevator door apparatus that includes, in part, a timer configured to produce time information, a door drive device configured to drive the elevator door; and a door control device configured to store time information and corresponding door opening position information. The door control device is also configured to select one of first, second, and fully open door positions based on the stored door opening position information that corresponds to the time information produced by the timer, and control the door drive device to stop moving the elevator door at the selected door open position.

Shea states that

the philosophy of program DTS is to open the car and hatch doors fully only when it is known or expected that: (a) there will be counterflow of traffic, i.e., both loading and unloading of passengers will occur at the target floor stop, (b) more than a predetermined number of passengers will depart the car at the target floor stop, or (c) more than a predetermined number of passengers will

board the car at the target floor stop. *At all other target floor stops, the doors will be controlled to only partially open.*³

Additionally, Shea indicates that other factors, including “a stored history or record of passenger transfers per floor by time-of-day” are used to predict when there will be a light flow of traffic at a stop of the elevator car. In other words, Shea indicates that a determination is made based on a target floor and stored history information of passenger transfers per floor by time-of-day. However, it is respectfully submitted that Shea fails to teach or suggest storing time information that corresponds to door opening position information and selecting a door open position based on the stored information.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Shea also fails to disclose “a door control device configured to store time information and corresponding door opening position information, select one of the first, second, and fully open door positions based on ... stored door opening position information that corresponds to the time information produced by the timer,” as recited in Claim 1.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 1 also patentably defines over Shea.

Additionally, Applicant respectfully submits that Unno and Mizuno also fail to teach or suggest the features of Claims 1, 11, and 20 noted above that are lacking in the disclosure of Shea.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1, 11, and 20, and claims depending therefrom, patentably define over Shea, Unno, and Mizuno.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of Claims 1, 3, 11, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Shea be withdrawn.

³ Shea at column 5, lines 48-57 (emphasis added).

Additionally, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of Claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Shea, Unno, and/or Mizuno.

Claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, and 18 depend from Claim 1 or Claim 11, which are believed to patentably define over Shea, Unno, and Mizuno as discussed above.

Therefore, it is respectfully requested those rejections also be withdrawn.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 1, 5, 7, 11, 14, 17, 19, and 20, and claims depending therefrom, are allowable.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Knesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)

Zachary S. Stern
Registration No. 54,719

996437_1.DOC